DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 818 SP 029 516

TITLE 1986--Incentive Programs for Teachers and Administrators: How Are They Doing?
INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE Dec 86
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrators; Elementary Secondary Education; *Incentives; *Staff Development; *State Programs; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Motivation

ABSTRACT

This booklet provides a brief overview of teacher and administrator incentive programs, discussing such aspects as leadership, funding, teacher support, evaluation, and outcomes. A chart presents information on the kinds of incentive programs offered by each of the states, followed by descriptive narratives of each state program. State contacts are also listed. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CAREER LADDER CLEARINGHOUSE

December 1986

ED288818

1986 — INCENTIVE PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS: HOW ARE THEY DOING?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Teacher incentive programs—in three years they have spread like wildfire, either as pilot projects or full-scale programs. Twenty-nine states are now implementing large-scale statewide teacher incentive programs, providing state funding for locally developed plans, pilot-testing models, or have state board of education or legislative mandates to allow development of performance incentive programs for teachers and school administrators. It is still too early to answer the question, "Are they here to stay?" But a new development raises the chances that career ladders or other incentive programs for teachers may be permanent. Several new state and national reports have called for changes in teaching—from a structure where the majority of teachers do the same kind of work and are rewarded based on experience and college degrees to a system where teachers are rewarded for doing different kinds of work or for simply being outstanding.

In many states, the structures to allow these changes are already in place or are being developed through career ladder programs. Performance of teachers is usually the key factor in determining who will receive incentives or move up the career ladder. This is a somewhat different approach than proposals that call for credentials and degrees as necessary to determine "master teachers."

Several trends and conclusions about the development of career ladders and incentive programs in the states are important.

1. **Leadership**

   Strong state, district, and school leadership has been and will continue to be a key in the funding, development, and implementation of state programs. Career ladder programs are a means, not an end. Real innovation will depend on school leaders and teachers—their willingness to make real change.

2. **Funding**

   There is no doubt that the incentive programs require substantial state appropriations, and state financial situations are determining whether programs are being implemented as fully or quickly as originally intended.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M.A. Sullivan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

For additional information contact:

Lynn Cornett
Southern Regional Education Board
592 Tenth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30318-5790 (404) 875-9211

3. **Teacher Support**

   Resistance to programs by teachers' groups has often been the case, although in several states and in many districts the programs have the endorsement of teachers' organizations. One point should be made—even where there is substantial rhetoric by teachers' organizations opposing the plan, large numbers of teachers are applying to be part of the program.

4. **Evaluation**

   Evaluation procedures are undergoing rapid and substantial changes due to the implementation of the programs. These changes include more information from sources such as other teachers, principals trained in teacher evaluation, and a greater focus on instruction.

   Negative perceptions about evaluation and programs have often developed because of poor communications and a feeling that some programs are designed to penalize rather than reward teachers. It is not clear whether teachers really want to be closely evaluated, recognized as outstanding and set apart from other teachers, or whether they prefer to be kept "behind the closed door."

5. **Outcomes**

   The most positive outcome thus far appears to be the renewed focus on instruction in the classroom by those outside the classroom, especially school principals.
   The most disappointing outcome may be the recognition that changing attitudes and changing the "way we do it here" is going to be as, or more, difficult than predicted.

Leadership

Governors and legislators, including many who placed career ladder programs in recent reform legislation, have been joining local boards of education as the primary proponents for incentive programs. As states face choices about funding programs, districts may have to make difficult decisions about funding with less-than-anticipated state help. For instance, the Virginia Pay-for-Performance pilot programs were funded for two years only. Several districts have made commitments to continue and expand programs, and a special Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education has recommended that the state provide support for local district plans.

The Maryland legislature passed a bill in 1986 calling on the governor to appoint a task force to examine issues related to teachers, such as incentive pay. The 1986 Tennessee legislature considered, but defeated, proposals for substantial changes in the career ladder, thus leaving the state career ladder plan intact.

District leadership and support for the programs are proving essential. *Career Ladder Reform in Utah: Case of Vanishing Effects?* observed that when district superintendents provided clear direction and early and continuing support of the career ladder concept, the elements of a more permanent program were evident. The report also noted that at schools where the principal supported the work of the teachers and allocated school time for communication with faculty, the career ladder concept was better accepted. Respect for teachers who moved up on the ladder was evident and applications for the ladder increased.

An outside consultant study on the South Carolina pilot projects found substantial differences among districts in understanding of the program and satisfaction, seemingly a reflection of district leadership. For instance, in one county one-third of the teachers who applied for the program reported they did not understand the program and half felt negative about it. In another district, almost all the applicants said they understood the program and felt positive about it.

The trend to allow districts a greater voice in designing and implementing plans is evident. Newer programs tend to be less centralized. Established, centralized programs are changing. The original Florida Master Teacher Program made decisions about which teachers would

receive bonuses based on comparisons to all state teachers on a written test and a classroom performance assessment. Charges that this led to more teachers in some districts receiving awards and the fact that local districts were not involved were two reasons that led the state legislature to amend the original program. In the replacement program some evaluation decisions are made at the state level, with comparisons to all the state's teachers on a written test. In addition, district evaluations of classroom performance will be used, with comparisons of performance to other teachers in the same district. The Texas career ladder program used local evaluations for the first two years because the state evaluation procedures were not available, but the charges of unequal proportions of awards to teachers in different districts were also made in Texas. Texas now uses a statewide evaluation procedure.

Funding

Performance incentive programs require substantial funding, and states and districts that implement them will have to make long-term commitments to fund them. These are decisions and commitments that most states have yet to make. Tennessee is clearly an exception as it has already committed over $250 million in the three years its career ladder has been in operation. Without adequate funding career ladders cannot become a part of the fabric of the schools. Some states seem to be turning toward some type of incentive program rather than a structured career ladder system—probably an indication that incentive programs are viewed as needing less long-range commitment in terms of funding than career ladders.

Other states are implementing programs slowly through pilot projects that are much less costly than full statewide programs. Funding for the South Carolina pilots has expanded from $2.2 million in 1985-86 to $6 million in 1986-87, but the $22 million statewide program has been pushed back at least a year. (The state is projecting a revenue shortfall in 1986-87 and will probably have to reduce spending on education.) Kentucky decided on a one-year, $2.5 million pilot program rather than the original two-year plan. North Carolina is using a pilot approach over a period of several years. The initial cost in 1985-86 was $11 million, with some $15 million allocated for 1986-87. Virginia provided $500,000 for pilot projects over a two-year period.

State budget problems, particularly in the oil producing states, are affecting career ladder development. For example, in New Mexico there had been discussion about instituting programs but they now seem at least temporarily stalled because of severe revenue shortfalls. Louisiana has delayed a pilot program because of budget difficulties, as has Arkansas. Funding in Louisiana is expected to be available in 1987-88 through money from a $540 million educational trust fund created through a state constitutional amendment.

On the other hand, Utah doubled the first year's funding to $30 million in 1985-86 ($36 million with benefits), and is providing an additional $4.5 million for 1986-87. California has gradually increased funds for the Mentor Teacher Program from $10 million in 1983-84 to slightly over $45 million for this 1986-87 school year. The new Florida plan is to be funded at $90 million before it is implemented. Districts are making substantial commitments. Fairfax County (Virginia), a participant in one of the state's pilot programs, has decided to implement its own career ladder with an additional $6 million for incentive pay for teachers. A Utah district reallocated funding from capital improvement funds to the career ladder program. Since career ladder programs are new, many are in the pilot stages, are often controversial, and are easy targets for budget slicing.

Support for Incentive Programs

A report on the Virginia Pay for Performance projects claimed that school boards, elected officials, and the general public supported incentive programs, while the principals and teachers were less enthusiastic. This observation probably sums up the initial response to incentive programs. As states and districts implement programs, rhetoric, legitimate criticism, and support are often confused. Public support is still quite evident.

Surveys of teachers in Tennessee and Florida last year showed that teachers were critical of the programs but, at the same time, large numbers of teachers have applied to become part of the programs. In Tennessee, close to 40,000 of the state's teachers are on the career ladder. At the upper two levels of the ladder, which have been the most controversial, 3,700 applications from teachers and administrators have been received for evaluation this year, and 2,500 teachers have already been named to the upper two levels. Surveys in Texas have been reported to show that teachers do not support the ladder, yet, 80,000 teachers qualified for career ladder bonuses last year.

A survey of the Utah teachers during 1986 (second year of implementation) showed that 68 percent of the teachers wanted career ladders continued (20 percent were opposed). (All Utah programs are designed by the districts.) A majority of the teachers felt the programs had made the profession more attractive, and viewed them as having a positive impact on improving teacher evaluation and instruction in the classroom as well as raising morale. The majority of the teachers favored retention of the programs; experience of the teachers did not seem to make a difference.

In South Carolina, a 1986 survey of those teachers who applied for the program and those who did not showed the majority of the teachers understood the program and were satisfied with it. The reasons most often mentioned for not joining the program were: Too much paperwork required; dislike of competition among teachers; and having family/children responsibilities. (The South Carolina program requires documentation of student achievement and other critieria such as professional development.)

Support from teachers' organizations has varied by state, with the opposition to the Tennessee program being the most widely publicized. The Alabama Education Association, as stipulated in the legislation, has been an integral part in the planning of the state's program and has provided support. Support has been given in Texas, South Carolina, and Utah. The original Florida Master Teacher Program was challenged in court by the teachers' organizations; the new plan has their support. It also seems that increasingly states are trying to involve the local teachers' organizations during the formative stages of establishing incentive programs. In Indiana, for example, a variety of state-funded pilot programs have consciously tried to involve the local bargaining agents in committees that are overseeing and designing these projects.

Evaluation

Improvement of evaluation procedures for teachers has been a major concern in implementing performance incentive programs. The fact that procedures not only need to be fair, but must be perceived as fair, has been and will continue to be the central issue in the programs. Jay Robinson, superintendent of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools when the Career Development Program was developed and implemented, claimed that "teachers are reluctant to accept solid, fair evaluations." Evaluation procedures are moving away from the principal "rating" the teacher on a checklist to procedures that include observations of the classroom activities, use of peer evaluators, instruments designed from the research, and other sources of information, such as student outcome data and questionnaires answered by principals, students, and other teachers.

Are the procedures, especially those being developed at the state level, too burdensome and expensive? Are district-designed procedures inequitable because of different standards in the districts? These are common questions. There are no simple answers. No "best way" has emerged, and probably never will, because of the diversity of states and districts. In those programs that have been in place several years, refinements have occurred. In the Charlotte-Mecklenburg plan, the teachers thought that classrooom observation focused too much on the "how to" in teaching and not enough on content—that was changed. A mix of announced and unannounced observations was usually used, but the teachers preferred the unannounced. The number of conferences between teachers and evaluators was reduced at the teachers' request.

In Texas, the career ladder program was started in 1984 using district evaluations that often were designed to make yes/no employment decisions. Beginning this year, teachers will be

evaluated using a state evaluation procedure. State officials believe that the development of the state procedure initially would have alleviated many of the criticisms about the program.

The Tennessee evaluation procedures were originally designed using criteria that were made known only to evaluators and not to teachers and administrators. That was changed the second year so that all are now aware of the criteria. An initial interview coupled with a detailed portfolio, which proved to be burdensome, was changed to an interview, with teachers presenting evidence of their skills. Beginning this year teachers will be evaluated during a semester rather than over a one-year period. In a study of a Virginia district's program, it became apparent that preparation of a written portfolio of information deterred teachers from applying for promotion on the ladder and that the documents rather than the quality of teaching were becoming the basis for decisions. The district task force overseeing the program believes that as the plan continues to be implemented, streamlining of procedures will lessen the extra burden.

In Florida, evaluation procedures used for the Master Teacher Program came under fire in connection with opposition to the program that awarded merit bonuses to only a small number of teachers. The Florida Performance Measurement System (used for classroom observations) and the subject area tests that were used for determining who received the bonuses were upheld in administrative hearings in the state as reliable and valid instruments for making the award decisions. In the expanded program, the state testing will remain; classroom performance will be assessed using locally determined instruments. It is expected that many of the districts will continue to use the state classroom observation instrument.

In Utah, a state review of the district programs reported that districts have refined evaluation procedures and now use a greater variety of information sources to evaluate teachers, including peer review and student achievement.

Several state and district plans call for the use of student outcome data in evaluating teachers. Over half of the Utah districts reported using student achievement in evaluating teachers. The legislation that established pilot programs in Arizona included the use of student achievement; most districts require a presentation of evidence of student outcomes by the teacher.

In Kentucky, the legislation included student achievement as one of the criteria to determine who moves up the ladder. A pilot project is underway this year to determine methods of mutual goal-setting for student outcomes and how information can best be collected.

The South Carolina School Incentive program is based on student achievement. Last year $6.7 million was awarded to schools where student achievement exceeded expectations based on several factors, one of which took into account the socio-economic status of students. In the Teacher Incentive program, student achievement is a central part of evaluation in all the models being tested. A 1986 change in the teacher program was to increase to 10 days (from 5) the maximum number of days a teacher can be absent and still qualify for the program. One criticism of the program last year was that technical expertise was not available to districts to work with teachers in developing ways to document student achievement. For 1986-87, $125,000 has been set aside for State Department of Education staff to be hired to assist districts in including student achievement in teacher evaluation procedures.

The Florida School Incentives program, locally negotiated, is continuing for its third year. Incentives are school-based and provide additional money for school employee bonuses. School selection is on the basis of schools exceeding expected achievement. A district's plan may also provide individual school-based awards to employees for categories such as attendance, superior evaluations, employment in shortage subject area, and teaching in a high priority location.

During 1985, the Danville, Virginia, schools instituted a career ladder program for teachers that included the use of student achievement scores. After a year of study, consensus was reached on guidelines for the program. Each candidate identifies student outcome goals and

prescribes how progress is measured. Committees of teachers and administrators review plans, assess information presented, and recommend promotion or non-promotion up the ladder. Third parties are used to administer and score assessment instruments. School-wide measures are used, if available, and interpretation of scores take into account student ability and other relevant factors. Information from student and parent surveys, student work, and student attitude inventories are among the sources that can be used.

Outcomes

Behind the "career ladder movement" is the desire to recognize and reward excellence in teaching. This movement also provides a means for changing the structure of teaching as teachers take on different responsibilities—becoming examples for their peers, or "master teachers." The intent is that through these changes, teaching will become more attractive, encouraging the best and brightest to become and remain teachers. Those are the intentions—what are the outcomes?

It will certainly be difficult to separate the effects of incentive programs from other actions such as raising teacher salaries and the possible diminishing appeal of other careers for women, for example, business. It is still too early to have answers to key questions:

- Do the programs provide career options that make teaching more attractive for the long term?
- Do the programs provide ways for teachers to develop and improve their teaching over the long term?
- Will the incentive programs change the "image of teaching"?
- Will schools become more effective?

We can see short-term effects that are occurring. The most promising appears to be the focus on instruction in the classroom and concern by those outside of the classroom. Principals are now being trained to evaluate teaching and learning. Incentive programs for schools depend on the results of what happens in the classroom and how much students learn; staff development is focused on instruction through identifying a teacher's teaching strengths and weaknesses.

In a recent study by Richard Brandt of the University of Virginia on the effects of a career ladder program in one district, a teacher commented that teachers are more aware of the quality of their own instruction. "Specific expectations had been made more visible . . . . this probably induced improved teaching effort in many instances; it also added stress and anxiety as well . . . . Griping about the career ladder was, in part, . . . irritation at being scrutinized more closely and being held up to higher, more explicit standards than ever before."

Teachers and school administrators are being asked to take a greater role in developing programs because of concern that many of the state programs are too "top down." Plans continue to show variation in control of programs, the trend being toward states providing funding for local programs.

According to Mike Garbett of the Utah State Department of Education, school teachers and administrators are beginning "to think out of the box" where the development of career ladder programs is concerned in that state. He noted that those districts with teachers and administrators willing to think in terms of innovative structures involving teachers appear to have the greatest chance of success.

Career ladder programs are changing higher education's response to teachers' and districts' needs. In several states that have instituted career ladder programs, the initial response from higher education was that they offered "Education 502" for teachers needing to work on particular skills. According to state and district officials that has changed. Colleges and universities are responding by designing programs and new courses as needed. In Tennessee, partnerships between higher education and the schools have strengthened, and higher

education is more involved in providing staff development. Training models for the career ladder program were jointly developed with higher education. The University of North Carolina at Charlotte is now working closely with the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School District to provide training for teachers as they move through the district's Career Development Program. In Texas, colleges and universities report that teachers are focusing graduate work more on curriculum and teaching as required by the career ladder guidelines.

In those states with incentive programs, teacher evaluation has changed, with a greater focus on instruments based on research, using additional sources of information, and providing training for evaluators. Procedures are being developed to make decisions about who will move up on career ladders, thus expanding the purpose of making a yes/no decision about employment. The question remains whether these new procedures will become too administratively burdensome.

Has there been an adverse impact on working conditions of teachers where career ladder programs have been implemented? Additional paperwork for teachers and school administrators has been reported in several programs. In Charlotte-Mecklenburg, additional paperwork was initially a problem and was addressed through computerizing much of the information. In South Carolina, teachers who participated in the pilot programs last year, as well as those who did not, reported that additional paperwork created concern. In Alabama, the implementation of the evaluation procedures to be used for a career ladder program was delayed partly because of reactions from school administrators that they did not have the time needed for evaluating teachers.

In Utah, a survey of teachers reported that the extra workdays provided through the program were used for planning instruction and clerical functions. In the Tennessee program more than two-thirds of eligible teachers have opted for extended contracts during the summer, providing for additonal teaching and curriculum planning at state expense.

Will providing teachers with opportunities to be out of the classroom improve their teaching abilities enough to counteract their absence from the classroom? In Tennessee, where evaluators are taken out of the classroom to observe teachers, the reaction has been that the evaluators believe their own teaching will be greatly improved through observing teaching in classrooms across the state.

Are the career ladder structures going to provide the needed long-term incentives needed to retain teachers? Does paying a teacher $3,000 additional per year beginning at the tenth year provide enough incentive in pay scales that normally top out after 15-20 years? On the other hand, teachers are expected to be constantly evaluated and meet standards to stay on the ladder. The counter argument is that the highest turnover rates for teachers occur before 10 years of teaching.

How real will the change be?

Although many have predicted (and it has been true) the difficulty of change within schools, real change may be even more difficult than originally thought. Teachers' organizations in some states stand defiantly against a change that will create unequal roles for teachers and provide pay based on performance. Many programs include incentives that fit within the current structures (such as extended contracts), and these are more popular with teachers than those that change roles. Opportunities to change structures are now in place, but will they be used for substantial change? Early indications are that additional efforts will be necessary. If a career ladder program provides for master teachers and opportunities to earn more money by taking on additional responsibilities, district leaders will have to consider carefully how best to use the resources available. If master teachers are to be models, they will have to be thought of in that way.

The career ladder programs provide the structures from which states and districts can begin to move into new models for teaching and the administration of schools. Career ladder

programs should not be dismissed because immediate changes at the school level have not been seen. Indeed, the new programs provide a way for schools to be restructured, superior teaching to be rewarded, and student learning to be a focus for schools. Teachers and school administrators must learn to use the new programs to develop innovative ways of improving schools. Success or failure of the concept now depends on school leaders and teachers—their willingness to make changes and the willingness of policymakers to listen and provide for needed changes in programs.

Selected Resources

Brandt, Richard M. "An Ongoing Ethnography of Career Ladder Planning." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, San Francisco, California, April 1986.

Bunch, Michael B., and Batchelor, William R. "Evaluation of the Pay-for-Performance Pilot Projects in Virginia: Final Report." Durham, North Carolina: Measurement Incorporated, 1986.

Malen, Betty, and Hart, Ann Weaver. "Career Ladder Reform in Utah: A Case of Vanishing Effects?" Paper prepared for American Education Finance Association Annual Conference, April 1986.

Nelson, David E. "A Statewide Survey of Teacher Opinions Concerning Utah's Career Ladder Program." Utah Office of Education, January 1986.

Smith, B. Othanel, and Peterson, Donovan. "Common Concerns of Florida Performance Measurement System Use in the Master Teacher Program." University of South Florida, April 1986.

Utah State Board of Education. "Career Ladders in Utah—A Content Analysis of Utah's Career Ladder Plans for 1985-86." Utah Office of Education, November 1985.

Waters, Trego & Davis Management Consultants. "Progress Report on the Evaluation of Three Teacher Incentive Pro gram Models for the South Carolina Department of Education." Report submitted to the South Carolina Depart ment of Education, April 14, 1986.

INCENTIVE PROGRAMS - 1986

	Local Initiative Only	Pilots with State Funding and/or Assistance	Full Implementation of State Program	State Program Under Development	Discussion No Legislative Action Pending	Type of Program
Alabama				X		Career Ladder
Alaska						
Arizona		X				Career Ladder
Arkansas		(Not Funded)				Career Development
California			X			Mentor Teacher
Colorado		X				Teacher Incentive/ Career Ladder
Connecticut		X				Teacher Incentive
Delaware		X				Career Development
Florida			X (1)	X (2)		(1) School Incentive; (2) Career Ladder
Georgia				X		Career Ladder
Hawaii					X	
Idaho				(Not funded)		Career Compensation
Illinois		X				Teacher Incentive
Indiana		X				Teacher Incentive
Iowa						
Kansas	X					Teacher Incentive
Kentucky		X				Career Ladder
Louisiana		X (1987)				Career Ladder/ School Incentive
Maine		X				Tiered Certification Incentive
Maryland	X					Career Development Incentive
Massachusetts			X			Teacher Incentive
Michigan					X	
Minnesota	X					Teacher Incentive
Mississippi			X			Teacher Incentive
Missouri			X			Career Ladder
Montana						
Nebraska				X		Career Ladder
Nevada					X	
New Hampshire	X					Teacher Incentive
New Jersey			X			Teacher Incentive
New Mexico					X	
New York			X			Teacher Incentive
North Carolina		X				Career Ladder
North Dakota						
Ohio					X	Career Ladder
Oklahoma	X					Teacher Incentive
Oregon	X					Teacher Incentive
Pennsylvania			X			Teacher Incentive
Rhode Island	X					Teacher Incentive
South Carolina		X (1)	X (2)			(1) Teacher Incentive; (2) School Incentive
South Dakota					X	
Tennessee			X			Career Ladder
Texas			X			Career Ladder
Utah			X			Career Ladder
Vermont	X					Teacher Incentive
Virginia		X				Career Ladder/ Teacher Incentive
Washington			X			Mentor Teacher
West Virginia				X		Teacher Incentive
Wisconsin		X				Career Ladder/ Teacher Incentive
Wyoming					X	

Southern Regional Education Board

Alabama

1985 legislation established the Alabama Performance-Based Career Incentive Program. Phase one, in which evaluation procedures for the plan were to be developed and implemented by the 1986-87 school year, has been delayed until the 1987-88 school year. Teachers were placed on the probationary (non-tenured) or Professional (tenured) levels at the start of the 1986 school session. A pay raise of 15 percent for all tenured teachers was granted. Phase two would allow teachers to move to Level II on the ladder, with Master Teachers to be named in 1989-90. The second phase of the ladder cannot be implemented until the legislature gives its approval to the program.

Fraught with political problems from the outset, the commission charged with developing criteria, procedures, and instruments for evaluating teachers developed a plan after months of debate. Last May the evaluation procedures were field-tested. The plan called for teachers to be observed in the classroom by two evaluators (principal or assistant principal or instructional supervisor) and information was to be gathered through questionnaires.

Training of school administrators to be evaluators was started in the summer of 1986, but halted. Evaluators are being trained this semester and a full-scale testing of the evaluation procedures will take place during the 1987 spring semester. Use of the evaluations to place persons on the ladder will begin if the 1987 legislature gives the "go ahead" for the program.

Alaska

Although there has been some discussion of a plan in which outstanding schools would be rewarded on the basis of student achievement, no concrete action has been enacted.

Arizona

In 1986 the state legislature amended the 1985 law establishing Arizona's career ladder program. Under the old program a five-year pilot project was designed in which selected school districts were to be allocated funds to carry out locally-designed projects, subject to the approval of a joint legislative committee which included 10 Arizona legislators, one educator, one member of the State Board of Education, and one additonal member. Of the 17 local school districts eligible to submit plans, 9 had their programs approved. The local programs were judged on such criteria as evidence that the plan had been developed in consultation with the district's teachers; evaluation procedures that stress a multifaceted approach to the assessment of teacher performance; a compensation system based on a completely restructured salary schedule; evidence of extensive teacher support for the plan; and a way to show how the proposed plan would result in improved student achievement.

Under the 1986 revision the details would remain much the same, but technical matters concerning the number of districts eligible to participate, the composition of the joint legislative committee, and the dimensions of the funding have been altered. The new program would permit up to five more districts to join the pilot program, conditional upon acceptance by the joint legislative committee and certain administrative requirements. The new bill also includes provisions for eventual statewide implementation subject to voter approval of a constitutional amendment increasing the aggregate spending limit for school districts as well as legislative approval.

The cost of the current career ladder program is estimated to be $4 million for fiscal 1986-87, which would increase to approximately $8 million by 1988-89. Costs could increase if more districts decide to participate in the pilot programs. A statewide system is projected to cost approximately $60 million.

Arkansas

The Teacher Career Development Commission, appointed by the governor according to 1985 legislation, was created to establish six pilots that would develop locally designed programs. Funding of $500,000 was to be available to fund the programs, with reports to be submitted to the State Board of Education for action in 1987. Because of revenue shortfall in the state,

the anticipated funding for 1986-87 is not available. If the funding situation improves, the pilot programs are expected to be funded at a later date. The legislation outlined that, for participation a district had to be paying its teachers salaries higher than the state average; develop the plan through the negotiation process, if applicable; and 30 percent of the district's teachers had to show an interest in participating in the project. Five districts qualified and submitted proposals.

The Fayetteville schools' project was designed with extended employment opportunities, and extra compensation for supervision of student and master teachers. Jonesboro schools' proposal focused on incentives for providing additional instruction outside the regular teaching day, sharing information and techniques with colleagues, and increasing participation in staff development activities. The Siloam Springs plan focused on professional opportunities to retain current teachers, such as incentive pay for creative ideas, attending or teaching in-service programs, and tuition assistance. The Mulberry plan offered incentives to improve performance and to provide additional training for teachers.

California

The California Mentor Teacher Progrram was created in 1983; funding for the program began in the second half of the 1983-84 school year. During its inaugural year, 634 districts participated in the program with a total state appropriation of $10.8 million. Legislation allows up to 5 percent of each district's teachers to participate.

During the past two school years, funding increased significantly. For 1984-85, $30.8 million was appropriated, which funded 2.84 percent of a district's eligible teachers to become mentors. A total of 742 districts participated and 4,362 teachers were designated mentors. During fiscal year 1985-86, 6,891 teachers were appointed mentors within 855 participating districts at a total cost of $44.75 million, which supported 3.75 percent of each district's eligible teachers. $45.75 million was appropriated for 1986-87. Even with the $1 million increase, the percentage rate is expected to remain at 3.75 percent due to increases in the teacher population.

Each mentor receives a $4,000 stipend, and each local district receives an additional $2,000 per mentor for support cost, such as training and release time.

The law requires that mentors spend at least 60 percent (but most spend more than 90 percent) of their time teaching students. Initially, mentors spent a majority of their out-of-classroom time working with teachers on curriculum and instruction, but now work has begun to shift to a training role, with mentors conducting workshops and supporting teachers through peer observation and coaching.

The Mentor Teacher Program was designed as a staff development resource and a reward for exemplary teachers. As such, it introduces an initial step toward a comprehensive career development system where teachers are recognized for their expertise and are given greater responsibility and rewards, whether in classroom teaching or working in curriculum or staff development.

There are currently no legislative requirements to evaluate the effectiveness of mentors. Local districts are encouraged to work closely with their mentor selection committees to ensure that evaluation processes are jointly developed, reflect sound measurement practices, and mirror the work the mentors have been doing.

On a long-term basis, districts are being asked to plan the future direction of implementing their mentor programs in two ways: (1) as part of a larger strategy for building teacher leadership, responsibility, and collegiality, and (2) to support curriculum improvement, staff training, and opportunities for all students to receive a comprehensive curriculum.

Colorado

As part of the Educational Quality Act of 1985, the state funded a 2-year research and development project to improve the quality of education in the state. Districts submitted proposals and are providing a portion of the funding.

Six districts have developed Alternative Career and Salary Incentive models under the program; six other districts have initiatives that deal with different roles, such as mentoring, for teachers. Several of these districts are implementing programs and providing incentives to teachers.

Reports will be made by the districts in June of 1987, with the State Board of Education making recommendations to the 1988 legislature on actions to implement.

Connecticut

Three teacher incentive programs have been implemented. In 1984, federal funds provided assistance for seven local school districts to identify and reward exemplary teachers and to help in statewide dissemination of information about the programs. A number of seminars and training sessions were held, at which teams of administrators and teachers from the trial districts discussed their programs; the teams also played a leadership role in district efforts to design and further refine programs. A handbook cataloging their various insights was produced for distribution across the state.

Additionally, the 1985 General Assembly appropriated $100,000 to establish a two-year competitive grant program for local and regional boards of education to develop model plans for teacher incentive programs; the appropriation specified that awards were to be given to districts of various sizes. Grants were awarded to five local districts during 1985-86. Applicants were requested to propose one of two types of programs: a planning program to identify needs and design career incentive programs, or an implementation program. As a result of evaluation, five programs received a second year's funding. Further evaluations will be conducted during the 1986-87 and 1987-88 program years.

Finally, the 1986 General Assembly established a broad-based commission to oversee the voluntary development and enactment of local career incentive and teacher evaluation programs. The commission is to provide training, guidance, and coordination to the local districts and a variety of grants will be made available to local districts for planning and implementation of their programs.

Delaware

Following recommendations by a Governor's Task Force on Education for Economic Growth in 1983, the 1984 legislature passed a resolution calling for development of career and incentive programs. After an outside consultant presented a model that was found unacceptable, an education consortium was formed to present recommendations on a career ladder plan. The three major parts of the consortium's proposal were improved compensation for all employees, a statewide performance appraisal system, and a broad program of staff development.

During 1985 several bills for career ladder programs were introduced, but failed to gain approval. Legislation passed in 1985 designated $300,000 for a career ladder program to be in place by October of that year or funds would go to the Department of Public Instruction. When agreement was not reached, the Department used the funds to develop teacher training models and implement a statewide evaluation instrument.

Through funding from an outside grant, a January 1986 retreat was held to renew and develop communications among all the groups involved. (Lack of communication had proven to be a major stumbling block in developing a program.) Legislative action for Fiscal Year 1987 includes teacher salary increases, a teacher incentive pilot program, and teacher recruitment plans that include scholarship loans for the top 50 high school graduates in the state planning to be education majors, and the development of marketing plans to attract persons to teach in the state.

The teacher incentive pilot program, being developed and implemented in the state's largest district in 1986-87, rewards teachers who demonstrate outstanding performance in teaching children. Teachers will be evaluated using the new state instrument being jointly

developed by teachers and administrators. The school board and local teachers' association are supporting the pilot project.

Florida

The Ray Stewart Career Achievement Program for Teachers, with wide support from political, business, and education groups, including the two state teachers' organizations, was created by 1986 legislation after the Master Teacher program, created by 1983 legislation, had been abolished. The replacement plan consists of three levels—I, II, and III, with Career Level II teachers expected to receive $2,500 additional pay. The original Master Teacher program was plagued with problems, stemming primarily from the fact that it awarded a limited number of teachers a bonus of $3,000, with no district involvement other than the use of district personnel to observe teachers in the classroom.

Teachers with four years of experience who are in the top 60 percent (as compared to all *state* teachers) on a subject matter test and in the top 50 percent (as compared to all *district* teachers) on a composite district evaluation are eligible to become Career Level II teachers under the new plan. The district evaluation is to include classroom observations by a supervisor and a peer. The district program must be negotiated locally and approved by the State Department of Education.

1986-87 is a planning year with implementation to take place in 1987-88. For the first year, the state has put caps on the number of teachers who will be eligible in each district—45 percent of the teachers who pass the test will be eligible for Level II; 25 percent, for Level III. If $90 million is appropriated by the 1987 legislature, then the caps are to be removed. If $90 million is not appropriated by 1988, the program will be repealed.

Teachers who met the standards for the Associate Master Teacher plan in 1984-85 will receive a $3,000 incentive for a second year. Teachers who qualified in 1985-86 will receive $500, and are eligible to apply scores earned on this year's test to the new career ladder program.

In a challenge to the program, the Florida Performance Measurement System, which was used with a written test to place teachers in the old Master Teacher program, was upheld as valid and reliable in state administrative hearings in April 1986.

Georgia

Mandated by legislation passed by the 1985 General Assembly, the State Board of Education recently endorsed a state career ladder plan developed by a 33-member Career Ladder Task Force. The program, to be phased in beginning in 1991, is for all teachers, instructional leaders (including building and central office staff, such as superintendents, curriculum directors, and principals), and persons who hold certificates but are in non-teaching positions.

The evaluation procedures, already under development through the Georgia Educational Leadership Academy, call for each supervisor and professional to establish job responsibilities and objectives for the year. Two formal observations of performance in instruction and classroom management will be conducted by the supervisor, with written assessments of strengths and weaknesses. The first observation is to be preceded by a conference. Peer observation is limited to that part of the evaluation process identifying strengths and weaknesses. The supervisor will prepare the final evaluation for the year. The evaluation procedures and instruments are to be pilot-tested in nine districts during the 1986-87 school year, with expansion to around 40 additional districts in 1987-88.

Persons who want to be a part of the program will develop three-year professional plans that include professional/academic development, academic leadership activities, and student outcomes agreed to by the supervisor and individual. Awards, which are to be market sensitive, are recommended at $3,000, $6,000, and $9,000 for Career Levels I through III. In 1989, all teachers with three years of experience who have passed the teacher certification test in subject matter will be placed on the Professional level of the ladder; those with less experience will be on the Probationary level. Phase-in of the other levels will take place after 1989.

A second part of the program will award bonuses to all certificate-holding personnel in schools that exceed expected student outcomes. A contract has been awarded to the University of Georgia to conduct studies for developing criteria for grouping schools to determine expected outcomes. The State Board of Education is also requiring each local system to develop comprehensive staff development plans based on state and local evaluations of system needs. Compensation for summer professional development must be addressed in plans. $5.96 million has been allocated for staff development in the 1986-87 school year.

Hawaii

A number of programs currently exist that offer incentives for teachers to relocate to remote areas of the state or to supervise pre-service instruction. As a result of a study to determine ways of enhancing the performance of the state school system, the State Board of Education has also recommended that a school incentive program be adopted. The State Board examined a number of alternative incentive systems, including a career ladder salary system, a merit pay compensation system, a compensation system that focused on salary differentiation based on job factors, and the option of no incentive system. The school incentive system was recommended for cost-effectiveness, because it would not require a large degree of change, appeared to be fairly easy to implement and administer, and seemed most likely to be accepted by all parties involved.

The Reaching for Excellence in Instruction School Incentives Program (REISIP) called for the 1987 legislature to appropriate $2 million for implementation during 1987-89. Participation would have been voluntary and would have required a two-thirds majority approval of eligible employees at the school in a secret ballot. Awards were to be issued on the basis of indicators that included increases in the achievement scores of students, daily attendance, co-curricular/extra-curricular activities, and percent of teachers completing Department of Education workshops or university courses. On the basis of these indicators, institutions would be designated as Outstanding, Excellent, or Superior, and allocated money on the basis of the attained category.

The REISIP plan, however, has been put aside for the time being, and is not scheduled for consideration during the 1987-89 biennium.

Idaho

Legislation enacted in 1984 permitted school districts to participate in the Teacher Excellence Program. $100,000 was appropriated for administration and assistance to local districts in developing career compensation plans in fiscal 1985, with the expectation that these plans would be implemented during the following year. The 1985 legislature, however, did not appropriate the funding for local career compensation plans due to economic considerations; $90,000 was provided, however, to the State Department of Education to continue a local district assistance program, with a verbal commitment to address the career ladder issue in upcoming legislative sessions.

According to regulations adopted by the State Board of Education in January 1985, districts wishing to participate must submit a career compensation plan, approved by the local board of trustees, that includes a three-level career path for teachers (similar plans for other certified personnel, including administrators, are optional); provides opportunities for extended teaching contracts; and furnishes opportunities for teachers to apply for training grants. Aside from the basic requirements, considerable flexibility has been allowed for districts in the development of their respective plans. For instance, a district committee could allocate much of the career compensation funding for training grants and extended contracts in the early years and in later years shift the funding to career ladder stipends. Plans for evaluating performance include using classroom evaluation, individual portfolios, questionnaires, interviews, and tests.

The 1986 legislature again did not appropriate funding for the local Career Compensation Plans, but it did provide a small allocation to hire an individual to help in the coordination of information pertaining to the local programs. Districts are still submitting plans for approval in anticipation of funding by the 1987 legislature.

Illinois

The Education Reform Act of 1986 authorized the establishment of a Center for Excellence in Teaching within the State Board of Education to conduct a study of teacher career compensation programs based on merit. The State Board of Education was authorized to fund five to seven pilot programs in local districts, with the results of the projects to be reported to the governor and General Assembly by December 31, 1986.

The pilot programs are designed to identify from an array of various types of compensation programs those which the General Assembly might then extend on a statewide basis. Proposals were solicited from all Illinois school districts, and 30 such proposals were received, all of which were developed by the school districts in conjunction with their teachers and a participating university. In March, seven districts, representing a diverse collection of sizes and types and with programs offering a variety of approaches to the compensation issue, were awarded grants to continue developing plans for implementation of a full year of career compensation during the 1986-87 school year. $1 million has been allocated for the implementation phase during 1986-87.

In a recent survey 19 of 997 local districts indicated they have some form of merit or performance-based salary schedule. Additionally, 11 districts stated that they successfully provide a wide array of roles and responsibilities for teachers, including differentiated staffing and mentoring.

Indiana

The 1985 state legislature allocated $6 million for career ladder studies and teacher incentive/reward/recognition trial projects. The bulk of the money has been used to establish about 50 locally designed teacher incentive programs. The hope is to acquaint local districts with issues and questions related to such programs and produce ideas for the design of long-range statewide programs.

Grants were also awarded to eight local boards for career ladder models. The career ladder programs are planning projects, consisting of committees for the purpose of studying issues related to career ladders and for drawing up models to be used when the State Board of Education is ready to submit a proposal for legislative funding. One of the issues to be addressed was the effect career ladders might have on collective bargaining with the teacher unions and the impact on base-level salary increases.

All of the projects include administrative representation and have relied heavily on teacher involvement in their research—some projects granted stipends for teachers to visit states with existing career ladder programs. In many cases local heads of the teachers' collective bargaining units are serving on the project committees. Funding for the career ladder initiatives will end in mid-1987, after which it is hoped that projects will submit models to be used to formulate a statewide career ladder system.

Iowa

In 1985 a task force reporting to the Iowa Department of Public Instruction proposed a career ladder system that would have been related to a four-tier certification structure. This was not approved, but a three-tiered system of certification was adopted. At this time, certification is not linked to teacher incentives.

Kansas

In 1985, the Commissioner's Task Force on Teacher Incentive Structures, part of a three-phase planning project funded by the U.S. Department of Education, was created. It is expected that this task force will eventually draft legislation but, to date, no statewide policy has been adopted. Local boards, at their option, can experiment with such programs, but only a small percentage of them have tried thus far. Due to a sluggish economy, there appears to be little prospect for the introduction of any statewide program proposals in the upcoming session of the legislature.

Kentucky

The Career Ladder Commission, created by 1984 legislation, has developed a program to be pilot-tested in 16 districts during the 1986-87 school year at a cost of $2.5 million. Because of fiscal considerations, the pilot, which was originally planned for two years, will be one year. Recommendations on a statewide plan are to be presented to the 1988 legislature. (The Kentucky legislature meets biennially.)

The program includes four steps in addition to the required year of internship for beginning teachers. Guidelines for evaluating placement are based on instructional performance, professional leadership initiative, and student achievement. Teachers who voluntarily participate in the pilot projects this year will receive a $1,000 stipend.

The evaluation procedures and instruments are being developed by a team at Western Kentucky University. The Kentucky Association of School Administrators is providing training for evaluators. Teacher evaluation will include observation of classroom performance and a "goals attainment" section. Field-testing of the use of student achievement to evaluate teachers is being conducted as a separate study in 12 districts. Teachers will present documentation of student outcomes in an effort to determine if a core of criteria can be developed for using student achievement.

Louisiana

After a Career Ladder Commission failed to reach agreement on recommendations for a Louisiana incentive program for teachers in 1984, various proposals were developed. 1985 legislation included the Incentive Pay Models Program and called for pilot projects to be established according to three models—a performance compensation plan, a career ladder program based on experience and performance, and a career ladder with additional duties and work time for teachers. Funding for initiating the pilot projects will be available in 1987-88. A group of representatives from higher education, the schools, business and other interest groups have been meeting to make recommendations about incentives.

Also being implemented, after funding became available through interest generated from an educational trust fund, is a 1986 law which created the Teacher Mentor Pilot Program. A mentor teacher in selected schools receives extra compensation for up to 10 additional hours per week. The mentor will be chosen by faculty in each school. After local evaluations of the program, the State Board of Education will make recommendations to the 1988 legislature on continuance. A Teaching Internship Program, which will provide new classroom teachers with a support team during the first year of employment, will also be funded. The team will include faculty from a teacher education program, the principal, and a master teacher. The internship can be extended an additional year, if necessary.

Maine

January 1, 1987 will mark the conclusion of a two-year certification pilot study by 20 Maine school districts. Under this plan there are three levels of certification—provisional, professional, and master teacher. According to the specifications of the trial project, beginning teachers serve a two-year provisional term, during which their progress is supervised and evaluated by a support system consisting mainly of teachers. Criteria for evaluation include professional skills in the classroom and knowledge of subject matter. After successfully completing the provisional term, teachers are granted a renewable five-year professional certificate. Professional teachers are eligible to apply for a master teacher certificate.

The pilot experience is credited with a renewal of teacher and administrator interest in improving instruction and increasing staff development opportunities. In addition, 3 of the 20 districts have formally adopted locally funded career ladders.

Joint meetings of the Teacher Certification Advisory Committee, pilot project liaisons, and the State Board of Education are scheduled to promote discussions about pilot experiences. In the winter of 1987 the State Board of Education will recommend legislative language for teacher certification.

The Maine Department of Educational and Cultural Services has been advising non-pilot school districts to prepare for enactment of the law. Among the things which have been recommended are: the creation of planning teams, comprised of teachers, administrators, board members, and interested citizens, to study the law, examine existing local staff development systems, and determine future needs; the utilization of a collaborative decision-making model to design a local teacher classroom appraisal and coaching system; planning training programs in effective communication, team building, peer coaching and observation skills dealing with the change process and other areas; and an exploration of the concepts of differentiated scheduling, regional support systems, state agencies and university resources, plus effective training and utilization of substitute teachers.

Maryland

A 1986 resolution of the House of Delegates established a governor-appointed Commission of Teacher Salary and Incentives to examine financial and non-financial awards in teaching and their relationship to the availability of teachers in the state. Specific issues to be addressed are needed salary increases, incentives, such as mentor teacher programs, summer employment of teachers to develop curriculum and conduct in-service activities, and rewarding of exemplary teaching. The Commission will also examine funding to ensure a well-trained and motivated teaching staff.

Incentive programs for teachers and administrators are continuing to develop at the local level. Legislation in 1984 enabled districts to receive state education aid to improve performance and develop programs.

Several school systems are continuing incentive programs already underway. The Teacher Plus program in the Frederick County Schools is in its second year of implementation. The program focuses on teacher assignments that recognize the professional competence of a teacher; it also provides opportunities for professional development through an additional 10 days of pay. Carroll County Schools provide differential pay for duties such as team leader or department chair. Rankings for administrative positions are also given. Prince George's County continues its program offering differential salaries to three categories of teachers: teacher coordinators, instructional support teachers, and instructional/administrative specialists. The teachers are selected on the basis of merit.

Several districts are studying or have new programs underway. For example, Calvert County schools are awarding teachers a bonus for perfect attendance. Worcester County Study Committee has presented a merit pay plan to be implemented in 1987-88 to the local Board of Education for approval.

Masachusetts

The Public School Improvement Act of 1985 established a far-reaching program of educational reform that included several types of teacher incentive programs. The act called for a minimum teacher's salary of $18,000, and state funding to pay for some of the educational expenses of those who agree to teach within the state after their graduation. The legislation also established the "Horace Mann Teacher" designation and the Lucretia Crocker Exemplary Education Program. Under the former, the Board of Education will develop guidelines for establishing programs for expanded duties for teachers, including responsibilities for training teachers, developing curricula, providing special assistance to potential drop-outs, and serving as in-service instructors or consultants. Subject to collective bargaining, school committees will designate the Horace Mann teachers on the basis of criteria supplied from the State Board of Education. Each school district may apply for a grant equivalent to $120 per teacher; maximum extra compensation for each Horace Mann teacher is $2,500.

The Lucretia Crocker program was created to award teacher fellowships to develop, replicate, and disseminate exemplary educational programs that have been successful in advancing academic and creative achievement and creating a better school climate. Exemplary programs nominated in January 1986 will be implemented in fiscal year 1987.

Michigan

The Michigan State Board of Education is not considering performance-based programs for teachers and school administrators at the present time. However, a committee established by the State Board of Education last year to look into policy regarding future teacher supply recommended, among other things, that the State Board set up a four-step career ladder for teachers. The ladder consists of internship, provisional, and continuing levels leading to master teacher status. It was also recommended that the legislature allocate at least 5 percent of state school aid funds for the professional development of teachers and administrators, and that state colleges and universities, in association with local education officials, develop mentor-teacher programs. Currently, the State Board is attempting to raise certification requirements for school personnel, strengthen standards for teacher preparation institutions, improve professional development opportunities for school personnel, create programs to improve working conditions and support personnel for effective K-12 schools, and require competency testing.

Minnesota

There is no statewide program of teacher incentives. Local boards, however, have been given discretionary power to adopt their own incentive programs using local district funds. The State Board of Teaching has furnished a certain amount of guidance for developing programs. There are no plans to introduce a general incentive system in the upcoming legislative session.

Mississippi

The State Board of Education recently approved an evaluation plan that awards $1,000 compensation to teachers meeting state and local standards. Legislation in 1985 provided for a $2,400 teacher pay raise in 1985-86 and a $1,000 raise in 1986-87. A $1,000 raise in 1987-88 is to be based on merit.

The program consists of a statewide evaluation using the Mississippi Teacher Appraisal Instrument, which assesses teachers in 42 skills, including the presentation of subject matter in logical sequence, the use of a variety of teaching methods, and how to use discipline effectively. Beginning in October, about 4,500 trained evaluators (administrators) will observe teachers for a class period. Teachers are being provided information about the process through materials and educational television programs sponsored by the State Department of Education. Teachers who do not show minimal competence on at least 38 of the skills will be provided staff development training in weakness areas, but would not receive the additional $1,000. An appeals procedure is being developed.

Superintendents and principals as well as librarians, counselors, and instructional and support personnel will also be evaluated under the new statewide evaluation program.

Missouri

The Career Development and Teacher Excellence Plan was a major part of a 1985 education reform act. A broadly based, 36-member advisory committee appointed by the State Board of Education proposed a career ladder model consisting of three stages. Both district and teacher participation is strictly voluntary, but if a district decides to participate in the program, the salary supplement level specified by the state ($1,500-Stage I, $3,000-Stage II, $5,000-Stage III) must be guaranteed by that district's supplement to state funds. In 1986-87 between 80 and 100 local school districts are expected to participate.

Local districts must come up with a district career ladder plan using the model developed by the advisory committee. State guidelines include: a three-stage career ladder format; a clearly defined level of performance relative to the district's performance-based teacher evaluation process for each stage; specified teacher responsibilities; and administrator and teacher participation in the process for recommending approval of teachers' career development plans and placement on the career ladder.

The state will allocate funds, subject to their availability. The funds will be distributed to the local districts on a matching basis; poorer districts will receive more funding.

Montana

Although two years ago the governor raised the issue of incentive pay for teachers, the state's legislature refused to consider the issue and it has not been raised subsequently.

Nebraska

Provisions for a career ladder were enacted by the legislature in 1984 as part of the governor's omnibus education improvement bill. However, funding has not been provided to the Department of Education for development of the ladder, and the legislature has postponed the implementation date twice.

Nevada

The Committee on School Improvement Through Incentives, in an April 1985 report directed to legislators and state and local education agency personnel, recommended that local districts be encouraged to develop various kinds of incentive programs with state funding. However, no legislation has been enacted and there has been no real movement toward any sort of incentive system in any of the local districts.

New Hampshire

The state's educational system is decentralized and 92 percent locally financed so that, although the State Board of Education has encouraged local districts to adopt compensation and incentive plans for its teachers, any action is strictly a matter of local option. Several districts are currently experimenting with some form of incentive program. The State Board of Education is monitoring such efforts with the intent of passing along useful information to other districts contemplating the development of similar programs.

New Jersey

The Pilot Master Teacher Program was abandoned, but the state of New Jersey has created a number of incentive programs as part of a significant commitment to teacher training and retention. Among the actions and programs undertaken by New Jersey are: the establishment of an $18,500 minimum salary for all teachers; the formation of the Governor's Teaching Scholars Program to attract talented high school students to teaching by funding all or part of their college education in return for service in the state's public schools; the funding of the Academy for the Advancement of Teaching and Management, which is designed to train teams of teachers and principals in proven techniques of instruction and instructional supervision; the establishment of the Commissioner's Awards for Outstanding Teachers in which 100 of the state's outstanding teachers are chosen to receive awards and to attend a three-day summer workshop for exchanging ideas with other of the state's educators; the creation of the Governor's Teacher Grant Program, with awards of up to $15,000 each for creative teachers to develop effective classroom strategies and to disseminate these strategies to others as models; the institution of the Master Teacher Program, a 3-year pilot program being tested in the Newark and Pinelands regional school districts to designate 5 percent of their teaching staffs as master teachers who will receive $5,000 annual stipends for extra duties that include conducting research, tutoring students, or devising new instructional approaches.

New Mexico

While the 1985 legislature requested continued study of performance-based pay systems, including various incentive plans and career ladders, a severe drop in state revenues because of the oil crisis has severely undermined efforts to establish any programs. Several funding bills failed to pass this year, and there is little hope that any sort of incentive plan will be enacted in the upcoming session of the legislature.

New York

The legislature appropriated $95 million for teacher salary increases in the 1986-87 school year. Other 1986 appropriations benefiting programs aimed at strengthening teaching were:

$4 million for a new mentor-intern program for first-year teachers; a $1 million increase (from $3 million to $4 million) in the Empire State Challenger Scholarship and Fellowship Programs for students preparing to teach in shortage areas; a $4 million increase (from $6 million to $10 million) in funding for teacher centers; and a $2 million increase (from $4.4 million to $6.4 million) affecting the Teacher Summer Business Employment Program, a system designed to pay private employers up to one-third the cost of hiring teachers during the summer period.

North Carolina

A Career Growth Plan for teachers and school administrators, mandated by 1984 legislation (revised slightly in 1985 legislation that extended the time frame for piloting), has completed the initial planning year. During 1985-86, a new statewide evaluation system based on effective teaching research and involving observation of classroom performance was tested, and evaluators, teachers, and administrators were trained in extensive in-service programs. Funding for the first year was approximately $12 million and will be slightly higher this year.

Sixteen districts participated in the pilot program; participants received a $500 stipend. All persons receiving an "at standard" evaluation were placed at Career Status I and will receive one additional salary step over the state salary schedule for the 1986-87 school year. Observation of a teacher's classroom performance is done by designated evaluators and the teacher's supervisor. Administrators are evaluated by the superintendent or a designee. The remaining two levels of the career ladder are to be phased in.

North Dakota

Recent discussions by the Teachers' Professional Practices Commission have concentrated on the creation of a state model for in-service education and staff development, as well as a system of teacher education program approval standards. The legislature will be in session January 1987; the funding for education is expected to be a major topic. No discussion on career ladders or teacher incentive programs has surfaced at this time.

Ohio

Although the State Board of Education adopted a Master Plan for Excellence in December of 1984, which called for the establishment of a career ladder and peer review program, no legislation has been introduced incorporating these recommendations. Miami University of Ohio has, however, been given a federal grant to study career ladders. The results of this study are expected to influence future debate on the teacher incentive issue within the state.

Oklahoma

A 1985 Educational Reform bill awarded teachers across-the-board teacher raises, but did not include a career ladder program that had been proposed. It did, however, require school districts to evaluate all tenured teachers and administrators once a year beginning in 1986-87.

In a statewide plan, research-based criteria were developed for teachers and all school administrators. Each district developed evaluation procedures based on the criteria. Training was held for school administrators (Principals and assistant principals are responsible for evaluating teachers.) in the spring of 1986 on how to observe and recognize the criteria such as "uses of instructional objectives."

Oregon

Although there has been some discussion of teacher incentive programs and some of the local districts within the state have tried to implement programs, during recent collective bargaining many were reportedly negotiated out of contracts.

Pennsylvania

In 1984-85 the State Department of Education awarded $4 million in grants to local districts for locally-developed efforts to improve instruction through training, to sponsor new programs

developed by teachers, and to provide incentives for teachers. Nearly all of the state's 500 districts participated in the initial program, which received the same appropriation for 1985-86. (For 1986-87 the state legislature increased the funding to $7 million). Sixty-seven of the districts have developed incentive programs. Allocations are made after local districts submit a written proposal for approval by the State Department of Education; funds are distributed according to a formula based on a pupil/teacher ratio. In another program, the governor presents a $5,000 award to the Teacher of the Year; eight other finalists are given a $2,000 prize.

Rhode Island

One district, with the help of a U.S. Department of Education grant, has developed a four-step incentive plan. Although no statewide programs are currently being considered, the State Department of Education is beginning to look at an assessment system as a part of the certification process.

South Carolina

The first year of a $2.2 million pilot program for nine districts has been completed. The pilot phase has been extended to two years, with funding of $6.0 million available for the program in 1986-87. (Full funding of the program is expected to cost about $21 million annually.) Revenue shortfall in the state has influenced program funding. The 1984 legislation called on districts to develop models in 1984-85. From those plans the state developed three models—a bonus plan, a career ladder, and a campus-based incentive program—all centered on the use of student achievement. The legislation, which originally said that a statewide model would be in place for the 1986-87 school year, now calls for the statewide implementation by the 1987-88 school year.

For the 1986-87 year, five new sites involving nine districts have been added to the program (five districts have developed a consortium model). One small district that participated last year is not participating this year. The program was funded at about $20 per student in 1985-86; for 1986-87 that has increased to $29. The sites include 200,000 students (about one-third of the state's enrollment). Also under development is a Principal Incentive Pay Program and a program for instructional support persons, scheduled for 1986-87 piloting and statewide implementation in 1987-88.

A school incentive program (created by 1984 legislation) continues to be implemented across the state. Schools are awarded cash incentives based on gains in student achievement, as measured by the state achievement testing program, and student and teacher attendance. During 1985-86, 310 schools (one-quarter of all the state's public schools) in five districts received awards totaling $6.7 million, for an average of about $30 per student. Schools must use 80 percent of the money to improve programs and cannot supplement salaries of teachers and adminstrators; stipends for summer curriculum work by teachers can be awarded.

South Dakota

In 1985 the legislature enacted a career ladder for teachers and administrators, but implementation of the plan was blocked by a petition drive which, although not aimed at the career ladder, effectively thwarted the legislation of which it was a part. Originally, a three-level career ladder certification system would have been created, but that legislation was repealed by the 1986 legislature; provisions related to only the first level in the original ladder were retained in the 1986 law.

Tennessee

Entering its third year of implementation, the Tennessee Career Ladder Program has a total of 40,418 educators at all levels of the program, which includes three-rung ladders for teachers (counselors, librarians, other instructional support personnel), supervisors, and principals. Salary supplements from $1,000 to $7,000 are paid to those named to the ladder. Voluntary for veteran teachers and administrators, all new teachers are required to participate. Funded at

$62 million in 1985, the program expanded to $85 million available in fiscal 1986 and is expected to receive $122 million in 1987.

The State Board of Education approved 1,471 teachers for the upper levels of the ladder during 1985-86, bringing the total to some 4,200 teachers at Career Levels II and III. Some 3,700 teachers have already applied to become a part of the program in the 1986-87 year.

Approximately 65 percent of eligible teachers opted the first year to take on extended contracts to earn the maximum amount of incentive under the program. In a survey of the state's superintendents, the availability of teachers for extended work was viewed as one of the most positive outcomes of the program.

The program has not fundamentally changed from its first year, but has undergone refinements of the evaluation process and has tried to include teachers and administrators to a greater degree in decision making about the program. Communication, a problem from the beginning, has been improved through additional written direct communication from the State Department of Education to teachers and administrators and conferences throughout the state to discuss concerns about the program. The cycle for evaluation has been decreased from a year to one semester.

Field-testing for gathering information about student outcomes to be used in evaluating Career Ladder candidates is in the second year. The testing last year included teachers presenting information to document student growth and questionnaire items answered by the principal and students about student learning and attitudes. The information was not used in making any decisions about placement on the ladder.

During 1986-87, the interim evaluation to be used for teachers will be field-tested. Teachers are placed on the ladder for a period of five years, with one interim evaluation midway through the period. The plans now call for the interim evaluation to consist of one pre-arranged visit from a state evaluator to observe classroom performance and an assessment by the principal. Results would then be provided to the teacher and principals for informational purposes and planning for the next full evaluation. Actual use of process will begin in 1987-88.

The Career Ladder program underwent challenge in the state legislature during the 1986 session, but emerged unchanged.

Texas

The Career Ladder Program, mandated by 1984 legislation, is beginning its third year of implementation. During the first two years locally-designed evaluation instruments were used to place teachers on Career Levels I and II. During 1985-86, 80,000 teachers qualified for Level II and received bonuses of $1,500 to $2,000. (If funding were not available, districts could provide a $2,000 bonus or reduce that to $1,500.) For the next fiscal year $150 million is budgeted for the program.

Beginning in 1986-87, decisions will be based on a statewide evaluation plan designed to distinguish among performances of teachers and encourage professional growth. The program assumes that teachers are capable of improving no matter what their experience or expertise. The appraisal includes four classroom observations by a teacher's supervisor and another evaluator. Areas include presentation of subject matter, the learning environment (motivation of students to learn), and a growth and responsibilities section ("plans for professional development, communicates with parents, and promotes evaluation of student growth"). Under the growth and responsibilities section, teachers will be given full credit unless documentation proves otherwise. Orientation on the system is to be provided. All evaluators have been trained.

Controversy surrounding the program has centered on the use of local district evaluations and the fairness (It is yet to be known whether the state appraisal system will be perceived as more equitable.), the fact that districts could supplement the state and district funding and provide incentives to larger numbers of teachers, and the total cost of the plan to the state.

Utah

In 1984 the Utah legislature provided $15.2 million for a career ladder system to be implemented during the 1984-85 school year. The appropriation was doubled in 1985 to $30.5 million ($36 million including fringe benefits), a figure which represented approximately $2,000 per teacher. Every district chose to join the state system, which required submission of a local plan to the State Board of Education. Although many basic features of the resulting local programs have similar characteristics, the Utah program is flexible.

Under the plan, funds are applicable only to certified instructional personnel. Features required of all programs are: the establishment of a career ladder committee at the local level; local plans developed through cooperative action; and a communication system among the career ladder committee and educators, administrators, board members, parents and other citizens.

The entire system has two components. One dimension represents funding for additional paid non-teaching days beyond the regular school year; not more than 40 percent of each district's career ladder allocation may be used for this and a detailed explanation of the use of such days is required. In the other dimension, at least 50 percent of the allocation is to be disbursed as reward for advancement on the career ladder based upon effective teaching performance. No less than 10 percent of the total district allocation for 1986-87, and 25 percent in 1987-88 (contingent upon full funding), must be spent for paying performance bonuses to educators judged as outstanding in regular classroom performance. Local district plans may use any remainder in the allocated funds for instruction and/or curriculum-related responsibilities.

Vermont

In October 1985, "Career Ladders—Master Teacher," a report of the Teacher Incentive Task Force, was issued. It presented the findings of a project undertaken by Johnson State College, as well as the task force's examination of several local district incentive plans that were either already in operation or in planning stages. The report addressed: (1) incentive systems, (2) career ladders, and (3) teacher evaluation. It was intended to result in a career development model designed to meet the concerns and questions of the teacher labor groups (VT-NEA and VT-AFT) and still provide incentives for teachers and for administrators. The resulting model called for a 3-stage career ladder for teachers, and a ladder for administrators that followed a traditional organizational model (assistant principal to principal to assistant superintendent to superintendent). The plan provides for three implementation variations: (1) local school district, (2) supervisory union level, or (3) statewide.

Four local districts had already begun to investigate the issue of incentive programs—two had actually drawn up plans, one was in the process of constructing a proposal, and one had dropped its investigation because of opposition from district teachers. The Dorset Elementary School District's plan has been approved by the local school board and teachers' association. Teachers meeting the criteria of the system will receive from $900 to $1,600 in financial awards.

Although there has been no move to enact such programs on a statewide basis, discussion continues on related issues among several state task force committees addressing such topics as teacher shortages and certification.

Virginia

Master Teacher and Pay-for-Performance programs were funded in the state for the 1984-86 biennium. The State Board of Education provided guidelines for the locally-developed projects. Funding of up to $50,000 per district was provided for five 2-year, pay-for-performance programs; three master teacher programs were funded in one-year pilot projects. The State Board of Education has endorsed the concept of incentive programs for teachers and contracted with outside consultants to evaluate the pilot pay-for-performance projects on three criteria: internal evaluation methods, public perception, and the value of the program for other districts.

Conclusions from that evaluation noted that the public, elected officials, and local school boards were more enthusiastic about the programs than teachers and administrators, yet evidence exists that hurdles such as communication, documentation of evaluation plans, and involvement of teachers and administrators can be overcome, indicating that pay-for-performance can work.

The following are descriptions of the programs and findings of the outside consultant's report.

Campbell County program was a merit pay approach in which group awards within a school were based on student achievement test scores, with a pre/post test design. Individual awards, which were in addition to group awards, were on the basis of peer selection and nomination. The district's regular teacher evaluation process was not used as a part of the process, but generally this caused no concern according to the report. There was evidence that the limited state funding of the project was detrimental to success. The local school board approved $80,000 to expand the project in 1986-87.

The Fairfax County project, a career ladder program, was field-tested in 1984-85, and approved by the district school board for the 1985-86 school year. The program failed to gain acceptance among teachers during the 1985-86 school year, according to the report. (In September a package was agreed to by the superintendent and teachers which would give teachers a 12.1 percent pay increase in 1987 and 8.8 percent annual raises over the next two years, with an incentive pay plan for all teachers by 1989-90.) According to the report, improvements have been made in the evaluation process, although a new category of "observing teachers" has emerged, and it is unclear how these persons will fit in the overall structure of teachers and administrators.

The Hopewell School District program focuses on selection and management of personnel in the school division. A new evaluation process has been developed based on the elements of effective teaching. Training in use of the instruments was considered inadequate. Administrators evaluate teachers, but results of peer observations are used to prepare a profile of strengths and weaknesses to provide direction for staff development. Teacher recruitment practices were improved and beginning teachers were provided additional help, including a new handbook. Considered a model for small districts developing personnel practices, the career ladder part of the process is not yet clearly defined.

The Orange County project focuses on the evaluation and staff development program already in place in the district. Essential effective teaching practices have been identified and teachers are expected to demonstrate the practices and improve instructional skills. Teachers receive $55 for demonstrating mastery of each skill, up to a maximum of three per year. All 12 skills are expected to be mastered over a five-year period, carrying a bonus of $500. Teachers are eligible for the bonus every five years. (Teacher concerns for the small amounts of the rewards are evidently tempered by the fact that all teachers are participating.)

Virginia Beach schools have implemented a career ladder program available to all teachers. Teacher evaluation, including improvement of the procedures, was an initial step in establishing the program. The plan includes five steps with salary bonuses of from $1,500 to $4,500. The teachers' organization tentatively supports the program. The program is under review. District-level administrators reported that the process of developing and piloting the program had been positive for the district.

Washington

In 1984, a panel appointed by the governor issued a draft report urging that a career ladder for teachers be developed—one of several proposals for enhancing the teaching profession and improving public schools in the state. Although this recommendation has not been acted upon, the 1985 legislature approved a Beginning Teachers Assistance Pilot Program.

During 1985-86, the start-up year, funding was approved for 100 mentor teachers to assist beginning teachers; this year the number of mentors has increased to nearly 700. Although

funding will end after the current academic year, the governor's staff is working on a plan for educational legislation which reportedly will ask that the present mentor system, with some modification, be made an ongoing program.

West Virginia

During the 1985-86 school year, each of the counties in the state implemented evaluation systems according to state guidelines issued in 1985. The plans are undergoing necessary revisions after the first year of implementation. The establishment of the evaluation plans in each district follows recommendations submitted in 1984 by a State Advisory Committee on Evaluation and Incentive Programs.

State-level policy guidelines on individual incentive programs are being refined. Two initiatives designed to promote the use of research on teaching effectiveness in the classroom are underway. One is the West Virginia Principals' Academy; the other is the West Virginia Teachers' Academy. These efforts, along with the county evaluation procedures, are providing a foundation for the development of individual incentive systems.

Wisconsin

Following U.S. Department of Education funding for a teacher incentives project, the Wisconsin State Department of Education issued guidelines and standards that could be used in the development of local district proposals for pilot programs. Funding for the pilots was granted for two years. Of the 17 districts submitting proposals, 8 were chosen as pilots; 3 specifically focused on career ladders. Funding is scheduled to end this year, but a two-year extension may be allocated for those who wish to continue their programs. No statewide legislation on either career ladders or teacher incentives is pending.

Wyoming

Although there have been no formal proposals for performance-based teacher incentive programs, a 1984 Blue Ribbon Committee on Education called for the development of criteria for judging teacher competency. In a minority report, some committee members raised the issue of consideration of merit in teacher compensation. In 1985 one district began a feasibility study of a career ladder program; this district remains the only one involved in the teacher incentive issues and is still continuing its investigation.

State Contacts

Alabama—Allen D. Cleveland, Assistant Director, Division of Professional Services, phone: (205) 261-2777; R.M. Guy, Education Specialist, phone: (205) 261-2777; State Department of Education, Montgomery, AL 36130

Alaska—Richard Spaziani, Deputy Director, Educational Program Support, Alaska Department of Education, P.O. Box F, Juneau, AK 99811 (907) 465-2900

Arizona—Judy Richardson, Legislative Research Analyst, phone: (602) 255-3171; Bill McCullough, Assistant Research Analyst, phone: (602) 255-3171; Arizona State Senate, Phoenix, AZ 85007

Arkansas—Elizabeth N. Taylor, Staff Liaison, phone: (501) 371-2304; Tommy Venters, Director, phone: (501) 371-1464; Arkansas Department of Education, #4 Capitol Mall, Little Rock, AR 72201

California—Laura A. Wagner, Special Projects Manager, State Department of Education, P.O. Box 944272, Sacramento, CA 94244-2720 (916) 445-1703

Colorado—Robin Johnston, Legislative Liaison, phone: (303) 866-6809; Mike Martin, phone: (303) 866-6852; Colorado Department of Education, 201 East Colfax Avenue, Denver, CO 80208

Connecticut—Gloria Williams, Consultant, Professional Development, Bureau of Professional Development, Box 2219, Hartford, CT 06145 (203) 566-5409

Delaware—Paula Lehrer, Administrative Assistant, House of Representatives, Legislative Hall, Dover, DE 19903 (302) 736-4182 or 571-3476; Ervin C. Marsh, State Supervisor, Certification & Personnel Division, Department of Public Instruction, Townsend Building, Box 1402, Dover, DE 19901 (302) 736-4688

Florida—Teacher Incentive Program: Juhan Mixon, phone: (904) 488-9513; School Incentive Program: Elaine Palmer, phone: (904) 488-8198; Florida Department of Education, Capitol Building, Tallahassee, FL 32301

Georgia—Joy S. Berry, Policy Coordinator, Office of Planning and Budget, 270 Washington Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30334 (404) 656-3800; Stephen M. Preston, Director, Division of Research and Leadership, 1862 Twin Towers East, 205 Butler Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30334 (404) 656-2008

Hawaii—Albert Yoshii, Assistant Superintendent, Personnel Services, phone: (808) 548-5802; Donald Nugent, Personnel Specialist III, Collective Bargaining Section, phone: (808) 548-6374; 1390 Miller Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Idaho—Darrell K. Loosle, Supervisor, Teacher Education and Certification, Idaho State Department of Education, 650 West State Street, LBJ Office Building, Boise, ID 83720 (208) 334-4713

Illinois—Susan K. Bentz, Assistant Superintendent, phone: (217) 782-3774; Barbara A. Core, Manager, Teacher Education Program Approval, phone: (217) 782-5859; Illinois State Board of Education, 100 North First S-306, Springfield, IL 62777

Indiana—Sue H. Talbot, Special Assistant for Education, Governor's Office, State House, Indianapolis, IN 46204 (317) 232-4567; Sue Drews, Teacher Quality Team, Department of Education, Room 229, State House, Indianapolis, IN 46204 (317) 927-0266

Iowa—Orrin Nearhoof, Chief, Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification, Iowa Department of Education, Grimes Office Building, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146 (515) 281-3611

Kansas—Dale M. Dennis, Assistant Commissioner for Financial and Support Services, State Department of Education, 120 East 10th Street, Topeka, KS 66612 (913) 296-3201

Kentucky—Stephen K. Miller, Executive Director, Career Ladder Commission, phone: (502) 564-2915; Sally Lee Gates, Assistant Director, Career Ladder Commission, phone: (502) 564-2915; Brighton Park Mall, US 60 Versailles Road, Frankfort, KY 40601

Louisiana—William E. Stephens, Jr., Assistant Superintendent, Louisiana Department of Education, P.O. Box 44064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804 (504) 342-3357

Maine—Edwin N. Kastuck, Coordinator, Teacher Career Development Project, phone: (207) 289-5918; Lynn M. Bak, Associate Commissioner of Education, phone: (207) 289-5918; Bureau of Instruction, Maine Department of Educational & Cultural Services, State House Station #23, Augusta, ME 04333

Maryland—Sheila M. Tolliver, Executive Assistant for Education, State of Maryland, Executive Department, Annapolis, MD 21404 (301) 269-3431

Massachusetts—Lynn Beal, Director, Legislative Office, Department of Education, Quincy Center Plaza, 1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, MA 02169 (617) 770-7306

Michigan—C. Danford Austin, Director, Teacher Preparation and Certification Services, phone: (517) 373-1926; Deborah Clemmons, Director, Office of Professional Development, phone: (517) 373-3608; Michigan Department of Education, P.O. Box 30008, Lansing, MI 48909

Minnesota—Kenneth Peatross, Executive Secretary, Board of Teaching, 550 Cedar Street, 608 Capitol Square Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101 (612) 296-2415

Mississippi—Jack Gunn, Deputy Director of School Improvement, phone: (601) 359-3768; Andrew P. Mullins, Jr., Director of External Relations, phone: (601) 359-3515; Walter Sillers Building, State Department of Education, Jackson, MS 39206

Missouri—Turner Tyson, Director of Teacher Education and Certification, P.O. Box 480, Jefferson City, MO 65102 (314) 751-2699 or 751-3847

Montana—John Voorhis, Director, Teacher Education, Certification, and Staff Development, Office of Public Instruction, Helena, MT 59620 (406) 444-3150

Nebraska—Andy Winningham, Education Consultant, Policy Research Office, Room 1321, State Capitol, Box 94601, Lincoln, NE 68509 (402) 471-2414

Nevada—Michael Alastuey, State Department of Education, Carson City, NV 89710 (702) 885-3100

New Hampshire—Judith Fillion, Acting Director, Division of Special Services, phone: (603) 271-3453; Donald F. Day, Supervisor, Office of Teacher Education & Professional Standards, phone: (603) 271-2407; Department of Education, 101 Pleasant Street, Concord, NH 03301

New Jersey—Richard P. Mills, Special Assistant to the Governor, State House, Trenton, NJ 08625 (609) 292-6000; Lloyd Newbaker, Special Assistant to the Commissioner, Department of Education, Trenton, NJ 08625-0500 (609) 292-1846

New Mexico—Susan M. Brown, Director, Educator Preparation & Licensure Unit, State Department of Education, 300 Don Gaspar, Santa Fe, NM 87503 (505) 827-6581

New York—Deborah H. Cunningham, Executive Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner, Office of Elementary, Secondary & Continuing Education, Room 875 EBA, State Education Department, Albany, NY 12234 (518) 474-4715

North Carolina—David Holdzkom, Director, Division of Personnel Relations, State Department of Public Instruction, Edenton and Salisbury Streets, Raleigh, NC 27611 (919) 733-9230

North Dakota—Ordean M. Lindemann, Director of Teacher Certification, Department of Public Instruction, State Capitol Building, 600 Boulevard Avenue East, Bismarck, ND 58505 (701) 224-2264

Ohio—G. Robert Bowers, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, 65 South Front Street, Columbus, OH 43215 (614) 466-2329

Oklahoma—Sharon Lease, Assistant to the State Superintendent, Department of Education, 2500 N. Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, OK 73105 (405) 521-4311

Oregon—Milt Baum, Associate Superintendent, phone: (503) 378-4772; Joyce Reinke, Director of Personnel Development, phone: (503) 373-7118; State Department of Education, 700 Pringle Parkway S.E., Salem, OR 97302

Pennsylvania—Roberta Waldman, 333 Market Street, 5th Floor, Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333 (717) 787-5820

Rhode Island—Edward L. Dambruch, Director, Division of School/Teacher Accreditation, Department of Education, 22 Hayes Street, Providence, RI 02908 (401) 277-2677

South Carolina—Teacher Incentives: David Harrison, phone: (803) 734-8217; School Incentives: John May, phone: (803) 734-8535; South Carolina Department of Education, 507 Rutledge Building, Columbia, SC 29201

South Dakota—Donna Fjelstad, Assistant to State Superintendent, 700 Governor's Drive, Pierre, SD 57501 (605) 773-3243

Tennessee—George Malo, Associate Assistant Commissioner, Department of Education, 112 Cordell Hull Building, Nashville, TN 37219 (615) 741-7816

Texas—Richard Swain, Assistant Commissioner for Professional Development, phone: (512) 463-9328; Susan Barnes, Director of Teacher Appraisal, Texas Education Agency, W.B. Travis Building, phone: (512) 463-9012; 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, TX 78701

Utah—Michael J. Garbett, Coordinator, School-Community Planning, 250 East 500 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84111 (801) 533-5330

Vermont—W. Ross Brewer, Director of Planning and Policy Development, 122 State Street, Department of Education, Montpelier, VT 05602 (802) 828-3121

Virginia—Everett B. Howerton, Jr., Deputy Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction, and Personnel Services, phone: (804) 225-2027; Sara Irby, Associate Director, Teacher Education and Certification, phone: (804) 225-2013; Department of Education, P.O. Box 6Q, Richmond, VA 23216-2060

Washington—Judy Hartmann, phone: (206) 754-6906; Ted Andrews, phone: (206) 753-3222; Department of Public Instruction, Old Capitol Building, Olympia, WA 98504

West Virginia—Robert Gabrys, Director, General and Professional Education, Room 330, phone: (304) 348-7805; J.R. Lewellen, Unit Coordinator, Professional Development, Room 337, phone: (304) 348-2703; Building 6, Capitol Complex, Charleston, WV 25305

Wisconsin—Kathryn Gilbert Lind, Program Director, Teaching Incentives Pilot Program, State Department of Public Instruction, 125 South Webster Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53707 (608) 266-1788

Wyoming—Dennis Donohue, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction, State Department of Education, Hathaway Building, Cheyenne, WY 82002 (307) 777-6213